

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 15, 17-20, and 23 are pending. Claim 15 is an independent claim. Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 21-22 were previously canceled. Claims 6-8, 11-14, 16, 24, and 25 are presently canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is introduced by these amendments and their entry is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 15-20, and 23 are otherwise allowable if they were to be rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action. Applicants believe they have addressed these objections in the forgoing amendments and, accordingly, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all outstanding objections with respect to claims 15, 17-20, and 23. The objection with respect to claim 16 has been rendered moot by the claim's cancellation.

Claim for Priority

A claim for priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/223,663 was made at the time of filing of the present patent application, as evidenced by the application's Bibliographic Data Sheet. Applicants have now amended the specification to reflect this claim of priority by including a reference to the prior application in the first sentence of the application, following the title.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action sets forth objections regarding the drawings and, more specifically, with regard to Figure 5, reference character 42, reference character 44 in multiple, and reference character 46. Applicants have subsequently amended paragraphs [0044]-[0045] of specification to correct some clerical errors and thereby obviated the objections to the drawings. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection of the drawings.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action sets forth objections of the specification based on informalities within the abstract and disclosure. Applicants have presently addressed all but one of those informalities in the amendments to the specifications as set forth above. The informality not addressed by the amendments is the one relating to line 3 of the abstract.

The Examiner contends that line 3 of the abstract should read “The invention is directed to An,” as opposed to “The invention is directed to an” as it does now. Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention. Though the Examiner cites MPEP §608.01(b) in support of this informality, the cited section of the MPEP does not support the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide proper basis for requiring such a change. If, however, the Examiner finds the informality to be cited in error, as do the Applicants, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections of the specification.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 15-20, and 23 are objected to because of the “view region mask” limitations in claim 15, and because of the alleged failure of claim 16 to further limit the subject matter of its base claim, claim 15. Applicants have amended claim 15 and, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection with respect to amended claim 15. The objection with respect to claim 16 has been rendered moot by the claim's cancellation.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-8, 11-14, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. However, with the cancellation of claims 6-8, 11-14, and 24-25, the §112 rejection with respect to these claims has been rendered moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 6-8, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,474 to Orr *et al.* (“Orr”). However, with the cancellation of claims 6-8 and 11-12, the §102(e) rejection with respect to these claims has been rendered moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly rendered obvious by Orr in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,457,574 to Eichenlaub (“Eichenlaub”). However, with the cancellation of claims 13 and 14, the §103(a) rejection with respect to these claims has been rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-4562 referencing the Attorney Docket No. noted above. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Daniel N. Yannuzzi
Registration No.: 36,727

SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &
HAMPTON LLP
333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1448
Telephone: (858) 720-8900
Facsimile: (858) 509-3691